

Department of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement

STEPHEN M. HAASE, AICP, DIRECTOR

INITIAL STUDY

PROJECT FILE NO.: PDC 04-046

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Planned Development Rezoning from CN-Commercial Neighborhood District to an A(PD) Planned Development Zoning District to allow up to four single-family detached residences on a 0.23 gross acre site.

PROJECT LOCATION: Eastside of Cypress Avenue, approximately 260 Feet southerly of Stevens Creek Boulevard (332 Cypress Avenue).

GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: Medium High Density Residential (12-25 DU/AC)

ZONING: CN

SURROUNDING LAND USES:

North: Residential (Multi-family)

South: Single-Family Residential and Commercial

East: Residential (Single family detached residential) West: Commercial (Retail)

PROJECT APPLICANT'S NAME AND ADDRESS:

Mohammad RahmaniAbdy MirzadeganFarajollah Ettefagh940 Saratoga Avenue, #112Post Office Box 50261802 Constitution CourtSan Jose, CA 95129Santa Clara, CA 95056San Jose, CA 95124

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial study:

	I find the proposed project could not have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
\boxtimes	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the project proponent has agreed to revise the project to avoid any significant effect. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
	I find the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT(EIR) is required.
	I find the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, but at least one effect has been (1) adequately analyzed in a previous document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) addressed by mitigation measures based on the previous analysis as described in the attached initial study. An EIR is required that analyzes only the effects that were not adequately addressed in a previous document.
	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, no further environmental analysis is required because all potentially significant effects have been (1) adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (2) avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are included in the project, and further analysis is not required.
Octobe	r 4, 2004
Date	Signature of Preparer
	Name of Preparer: Rebekah Ross Phone No.: (408) 277-3748

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact		Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Information Sources
I. AESTHETICS - Would the project:					
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				\boxtimes	1,2
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock out-croppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				\boxtimes	1,2
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?					1,2
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?					1,2
e) Increase the amount of shade in public and private open space on adjacent sites?			\boxtimes		1,2
various means including the demolition of an existing single-fam construction of four (4) single-family detached units. The archite exterior lighting, and design have been review by Planning staff will not result in significant impact with regards to aesthetics. Th family detached development consistent with the surrounding me The proposed rezoning would not result in a development, which resources and/or heritage trees nor create substantial light and gla MITIGATION MEASURES: No mitigation is required. II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES - Would the project: a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring	ectural and to ensure he propose alti-family h would su	d site design, is compliance with ed project would and single-far abstantially eff	ncluding c th design a ld allow a mily detact ect scenic	colors, r so that four (4) thed nei vistas,	materials, a the project) lot single ighborhood historic
Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a					1,3,4
Williamson Act contract? c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?					1,3,4
FINDINGS: The subject site is currently zoned Commercial Nei built-out with single-family, multi-family residences and nearby in an area identified as prime farmland. Therefore, the proposed City or Regional agricultural resources.	commerci	ial structures.	The project	ct site is	s not locate
MITIGATION MEASURES: No mitigation is required.					
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?					1,14
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?				\boxtimes	1,14
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is classified as non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that					1,14

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Vigniticant Math	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Information Sources
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				\boxtimes	1,14
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				\boxtimes	1,14

FINDINGS: The City of San Jose uses the threshold of significance established by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) to assess air quality impacts. Based on the BAAQMD threshold of significance, projects that generate fewer than 2,000 vehicle trips per day are not considered major air pollutant contributors and do not require a technical air quality study. As this project will only generate approximately 40 vehicle trips per day, no air quality study was prepared for this project.

Temporary air quality impacts may result from demolition of the existing structure(s) and other construction activities on the subject site. Implementation of the mitigation measures listed below will reduce the temporary construction impacts to a less than significant level.

MITIGATION MEASURES:

The following construction practices shall be implemented during all phases of construction for the proposed project.

- Water all active construction areas at least twice daily or as often as needed to control dust emissions.
- Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials and/or ensure that all trucks hauling such materials maintain at least two feet of freeboard.
- Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites.
- Sweep daily or as often as needed with water sweepers all paved access roads, parking areas at construction sites to control dust.
- Sweep public streets daily, or as often as needed, with water sweepers, to keep streets free of visible soil material.
- Hydroseed or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for ten days or more).
- Enclose, cover, water twice daily or apply non-toxic soil binders to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.) sufficient to prevent visible airborne dust.
- Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 mph.
- Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways.
- Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES - Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			1,10
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any aquatic, wetland, or riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		\boxtimes	1,6,10

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Information Sources
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc., through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				\boxtimes	1,6
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				\boxtimes	1,10
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?					1,11
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?					1,2

FINDINGS: No rare, threatened, endangered or special status species of flora or fauna are known to inhabit the site. The City of San José has established regulations for removal of trees. The proposed development will result in no removal of trees because no trees currently exist on the subject site. Four street trees and eighteen landscaping trees shall be planted on the subject site. The species of trees to be planted on the site will be determined in consultation with the City Arborist and the Department of Planning, Building, and Code Enforcement. In addition to the street and landscaping trees to be planted, dense foliage shall be planted along the building outlines and within the side yards of the detached residences. All landscaping features shall be planted in compliance with the City of San Jose's Landscaping policies.

MITIGATION MEASURES: No mitigation is required.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the proje	iect	proi	the	bluo	- Wa	CES -	UF	SC	\mathbf{RE}	RAL	Ш	LI	\mathbf{CU}	V.	
---	------	------	-----	------	------	-------	----	----	---------------	-----	---	----	---------------	----	--

vi cellenill nesocitels violin inc projecti			
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?			1,7
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	\boxtimes	\boxtimes	1,8
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site, or unique geologic feature?			1,8
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			1,8

FINDINGS: The proposed project includes the demolition of the existing single-family residence and associated buildings to make way for a future development. The subject house was built in 1961 and is not listed on the National Register, the California Register of the City of San Jose's Historic Inventory list, and does not appear to be eligible for listing in any of these registers. The proposed demolition of this building would have no impact on cultural resources.

The project site is located in an area designated as archeologically sensitive.

A cultural resource evaluation was carried out for the property at 332 Cypress Avenue in the City of San Jose. The research included an archival search of the State records and a surface study of the property. The archival research

Issues	Potentially Significant Significant Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Mitigation Incorporated Sources
--------	---

revealed that there are no recorded archaeological sites within the proposed project area, and no sites within one half mile.

No cultural materials, prehistoric or historic, were noted during surface reconnaissance. Therefore, it is concluded that the proposed project will have no impact on cultural resources.

MITIGATION MEASURES: As required by County ordinance, this project has incorporated the following guidelines. - Pursuant to Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, and Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code of the State of California in the event of the discovery of human remains during construction, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains. The Santa Clara County Coroner shall be notified and shall make a determination as to whether the remains are Native American. If the Coroner determines that the remains are not subject to his authority, he shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission who shall attempt to identify descendants of the deceased Native American. If no satisfactory agreement can be reached as to the disposition of the remains pursuant to this State law, then the land owner shall reinter the human remains and items associated with Native American burials on the property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS - Would the project:

	\boxtimes	1,5,24
	\boxtimes	1,5,24
		1,5,24
		1,5,24
	\boxtimes	1,5,24

FINDINGS: The project site is located within the seismically active San Francisco region, which requires that the building be designed and built in conformance with the requirements of the 1997 Uniform Building Code for Seismic Zone 4. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, a soils report addressing the potential

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Cioniticant Math	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Information Sources
--------	--------------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------------	--------------	------------------------

hazards of liquefactions must be submitted to and accepted by the City Engineering Geologist. As the project includes these required measures, the potential for seismic impacts will be less than significant.

MITIGATION MEASURES: No mitigation is required.

VII.	HAZARDS A	ND HAZARDOUS M	1ATERIALS -	Would the	project:
------	-----------	----------------	-------------	-----------	----------

THE THE STATE STATES OF STATES AND STATES OF S	 		
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			1
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			1
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			1
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?			1,12
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?			1,2
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?			1
g) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?		\boxtimes	1,2
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?		\boxtimes	1

FINDINGS: Development of the proposed project will require the demolition of two (2) structures on the site, which may contain asbestos building materials and/or lead-based paint. In conformance with State and Local laws, a visual inspection/pre-demolition survey, and possible sampling, was conducted to determine the presence of asbestos-containing materials and/or lead-based paint.

The results of a site reconnaissance performed on 10/25/04 and 10/28/04 did not reveal the presence of any suspected asbestos containing construction materials. However, since the building was built prior to 1979, it is suspected that asbestos-containing material might have been used.

All potentially friable asbestos-containing materials shall be removed in accordance with National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) guidelines prior to building demolition or renovation that may disturb the materials. All demolition activities will be undertaken in accordance with Cal/OSHA standards, contained in Title 8 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR), Section 1529, to protect workers from exposure to asbestos. Materials containing more than one percent asbestos are also subject to Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) regulations.

Issues	Potentially Significant Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated Impact	ant No Information Impact Sources
--------	--	--

During demolition activities, all building materials containing lead-based paint shall be removed in accordance with Cal/OSHA Lead in Construction Standard, Title 8, California Code of Regulations 1532.1, including employees training, employee air monitoring and dust control. Any debris or soil containing lead-based paint or coatings will be disposed of at landfills that meet acceptance criteria for the waste being disposed.

Demolition done in conformance with these Federal, State and Local laws and regulations, will avoid significant exposure of construction workers and/or the public to asbestos and lead-based paint.

MITIGATION MEASURES: No Mitigation is required.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:

VIII: HIDROEGGI MAD WATER QUAETII	outa the project			
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			\boxtimes	1,15
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate existing nearby wells would drop to a level which wou support existing land uses or planned uses for which pe have been granted)?	of the of pre-ld not ermits		\boxtimes	1
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the sarea, including the alteration of the course of a stream river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosiltation on-or off-site?	or 📗			1
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the sarea, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amountained surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding off-site?	ount of		\boxtimes	1
 e) Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage sy or provide substantial additional sources of polluted run 	stems \square			1,17
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			\boxtimes	1
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as m on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Map or other flood hazard delineation map?			\boxtimes	1,9
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures the would impede or redirect flood flows?	at 🗆			1,9
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding result of the failure of a levee or dam?				1
j) Be subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflo	w?		\boxtimes	1

FINDINGS: Based on the FEMA flood insurance maps for the City of San Jose, the project site is not located within a 100-year floodplain and would therefore have no impact on 100-year flows. The project would not expose people to flood hazards associated with the 100-year flood. The site is not subject to seiche or tsunami.

The proposed project is 0.23 acres in size. The site is currently covered with minimal impervious surfaces consisting mostly of the footprint of the existing structures on site. The proposed project for four (4) single-family detached units would increase the amount of impervious surface consisting of the new residential footprints and driveway and porch

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Cioniticant Math	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Information Sources
--------	--------------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------------	--------------	------------------------

areas. The project could result in temporary water quality impacts during construction activity and from the increase of impervious surfaces resulting from the proposed development. The required mitigation listed below would reduce these potential impacts to a less than significant level.

Storm Water Management. The project shall conform with the City of San Jose National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Storm Water Permit and shall include Best Management Practices (BMPs) as specified in the *Blueprint for a Clean Bay* to control the discharge of storm water pollutants including sediments associated with construction activities. To obtain a copy of the booklet or other information about the NPDES permit requirements, please call the Department of Public Works at (408) 277-5161.

MITIGATION MEASURES:

Zoning Phase

Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant must submit a Notice of Intent to the State Water Resources Control Board and prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for controlling storm water discharges associated with construction activity to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works.

Planned Development Permit Phase

Prior to the issuance of a Planned Development Permit, the applicant must provide details of specific best management practices (BMPs) including, but not limited to, bioswales, disconnected downspouts, landscaping to reduce impervious surface area, and inlets stenciled, "No dumping – Flows to Bay" to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement.

Construction Phase Mitigation:

- During construction, burlap bags filled with drain rock will be installed around storm drains to route sediment and other debris away from the drains.
- During construction, earthmoving or other dust producing activities would be suspended during periods of high winds.
- During construction, all exposed or disturbed soil surfaces would be watered at least twice daily to control dust as necessary.
- During construction, stockpiles of soil or other materials that can be blown by the wind would be watered or covered.
- During construction, all trucks hauling soil, sand and other loose materials would be covered and/or all trucks would be required to maintain at least two feet of freeboard.
- All paved access roads, parking and staging areas and residential streets adjacent to the construction sites would be swept daily with water sweepers.

The proposed project shall implement post construction.

Post Construction Mitigation:

- Plant vegetation to control erosion and enhance sediment entrapment. Deep-rooted plants help to build soil porosity. Plant leaf surface area helps to collect rainwater before it lands on the soil. Turf grass lawns, woody perennials and cobbles can all be used. Trees are also a highly effective in retaining rainwater before it lands on the soil.
- Integrate into all landscaped areas grassy swales (biofilters). Parking lots should drain to the grassy swales.
- Permeable pavements should be installed to the greatest extent possible. Permeable pavement types include pervious concrete, porous asphalt, turf block, brick, natural stone, concrete unit pavers, crushed

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Information Sources
aggregate and cobbles. Driveways, pedestrian walky permeable paving materials.	vays and	surface parking	g area are	ideal lo	cations for
Rooftop areas should drain directly into landscaped a IN LAND HEE AND BLANNING BY AND BLANNING BY	areas. Ber	nign roofing ma	aterials sh	ould be	used.
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project: a) Physically divide an established community?					1,2
					1,2
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?					1,2
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?					1,2
FINDINGS: The proposed project will not physically divide an ereasonably complies with setbacks required by the City of San Jopossible impacts to surrounding land uses. MITIGATION MEASURES: No mitigation is required. X. MINERAL RESOURCES - Would the project:					
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				\boxtimes	1,2,23
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				\boxtimes	1,2,23
FINDINGS: The project site is within a developed urban area. The from the loss of availability of a known mineral resource.	The projec	et would not re	sult in a si	gnifica	nt impact
MITIGATION MEASURES: No mitigation is required.					
XI. NOISE - Would the project result in:					
a) Exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?					1,2,13, 18
b)Exposure of persons to, or generation of, excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				\boxtimes	1
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				\boxtimes	1
d)A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?		\boxtimes			1
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				\boxtimes	1

1 110 1 10. 11111141	Suddy Tummed Beveropment regenting 1 Bever 0.10			- "	50 1 10. 1	
	Issues	Potentially Significant Impact		Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Information Sources
the project	ect within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would t expose people residing or working in the project cessive noise levels?				\boxtimes	1
expected to it to result in e in the City's	The proposed use is consistent with the surrounding increase noise levels above existing conditions. However, the exposing persons to a temporary increase in the general Plan. The mitigation measures require activities to a less than significant level.	wever, dur ration of n	ing construction oise levels in e	on of the si excess of s	te there tandare	e is expected ls establishe
The project s	site is not located within an airport land use plan or	in the vicir	nity of a privat	e airstrip.		
	ON MEASURES: <i>Temporary Construction:</i> The fonstruction related noise impacts.	ollowing m	easures have b	een includ	led to r	educe
1.	Construction activities will be limited to the period Friday for any activity, on or off-site, within 500 f			7:00 PM N	Ionday	through
2.	The contractor will be required to use "new technology art noise shielding and muffling devices. All interplate be equipped with adequate mufflers and would be created by faulty or poorly maintained engines or expected."	nal combu in good m	stion engines techanical cond	used on the	e projec	et site shall
XII. POI	PULATION AND HOUSING - Would the projec	t:				
	ostantial population growth in an area, either					
businesses	or example, by proposing new homes and s) or indirectly (for example, through extension of ther infrastructure)?					1,2
	substantial numbers of existing housing,					
· .	ing the construction of replacement housing					1
elsewhere'						
	substantial numbers of people, necessitating the on of replacement housing elsewhere?					1
one vacant s	The project involves the development of an underlyingle-family detached home. Four (4) single-family ith the General Plan designation for the site.					
MITIGATIO	ON MEASURES: No mitigation is required.					
	BLIC SERVICES - Would the project:	•				
the provisi facilities, t facilities, t environme service rat	substantial adverse physical impacts associated with ion of new or physically altered governmental the need for new or physically altered governmental the construction of which could cause significant ental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable ios, response times or other performance objectives the public services:					
	Protection?				\boxtimes	1,2
Poli	ce Protection?					1,2
Scho	ools?				\boxtimes	1,2

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Information Sources			
Parks?					1,2			
Other Public Facilities?					1,2			
FINDINGS: The project site is located in an urbanized area of San Jose, and well served by existing Fire, Police, School, Park and other Public Facilities. No additional Fire or Police personnel or equipment are necessary to serve the proposed project. This project will be required to pay the applicable development impact fees to offset its effect on public services. MITIGATION MEASURES: No mitigation is required.								
XIV. RECREATION								
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?					1,2			
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				\boxtimes	1,2			
required to conform to the PDO and PIO. The acreage of parklar Formula outlined in the Parkland Dedication Ordinance. The proposed project would increase the number of residents on residential population using nearby recreational facilities, it is no that substantial deterioration would occur or be accelerated. This PIO to offset its incremental impacts. MITIGATION MEASURES: No mitigation is required. XV. TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC - Would the project	the site. At expected s project v	Although the p	roject wou	ıld add xisting	to the parks such			
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to	: t:							
the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio of roads, or congestion at intersections)?			\boxtimes		1,2,19			
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				\boxtimes	1,2,19			
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				\boxtimes	1,19			
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible land uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				\boxtimes	1,19			
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?				\boxtimes	1,20			
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?					1,18			

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Information Sources
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?					1,2,18
FINDINGS: The proposed project would increase the number of cause an increase in traffic, it is not expected to increase traffic to trips would occur or be accelerated. MITIGATION MEASURES: No mitigation required.			_		•
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS - Would the	project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				\boxtimes	1,15
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				\boxtimes	1,2,21
c) Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				\boxtimes	1,17
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				\boxtimes	1,22
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				\boxtimes	1,21
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				\boxtimes	1,21
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?					1,21
FINDINGS: The proposed project will not exceed wastewater to water or wastewater facilities or result in construction of new sto existing solid waste facilities and will be in compliance with all a solid waste. The proposed project shall conform to Chapter 15.2 Control Plan	rmwater f applicable	federal, state	project wi and local r	ll be se egulati	rved by ons related to
MITIGATION MEASURES: No mitigation required. XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE					
a) Does the project have the potential to (1) degrade the quality of the environment, (2) substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, (3) cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, (4) threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, (5) reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or (6) eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?					1,10

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Nouthcourt With	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Information Sources
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects and the effects of other current projects.					1,16
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				\boxtimes	1

FINDINGS: The area of development is currently developed with residential dwelling units and commercial buildings. The proposed project will not have a significant effect in terms of the mandatory findings of significance in that the subject site does not contain any fish, wildlife, and endangered species or habitat. It does not contain significant historic resources. Identified environmental impacts can be reduced to a less than significant impact level with mitigation

MITIGATION MEASURES: No mitigation required

CHECKLIST REFERENCES

- 1. Environmental Clearance Application File No.
- 2. San Jose 2020 General Plan
- 3. USDA, Soil Conservation Service, Soil Survey of SC County, August 1968
- 4. USDA, Soil Conservation Service, Important Farmlands of SC County map, June 1979
- 5. State of California's Geo-Hazard maps / Alquist Priolo Fault maps
- 6. Riparian Corridor Policy Study 1994
- 7. San Jose Historic Resources Inventory
- 8. City of San Jose Archeological Sensitivity Maps
- 9. FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map, Santa Clara County, 1986
- 10. California Department of Fish & Game, California Natural Diversity Database, 2001
- 11. City of San Jose Heritage Tree Survey Report
- 12. California Environmental Protection Agency Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List, 1998
- 13. City of San Jose Noise Exposure Map for the 2020 General Plan
- 14. BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, Bay Area Air Quality Management District. April 1996, revised 1999.
- 15. San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board 1995 Basin Plan
- 16. Final Environmental Impact Report, City of San Jose, SJ 2020 General Plan
- 17. Santa Clara Valley Water District
- 18. City of San Jose Title 20 Zoning Ordinance
- 19. San Jose Department of Public Works
- 20. San Jose Fire Department
- 21. San Jose Environmental Services Department

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Cioniticant Math	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Information Sources
--------	--------------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------------	--------------	------------------------

- 22. San Jose Water Company, Great Oaks Water Company
- 23. California Division of Mines and Geology
- 24. Cooper Clark, San Jose Geotechnical Information Maps, July 1974
- 25.